

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| Christopher Hudson, #284870, |) | |
| |) | Civil Action No. 3:06-2215-MBS-JRM |
| Petitioner, |) | |
| |) | |
| vs. |) | |
| |) | |
| |) | |
| Elaine Pinson, Warden of Walden |) | <u>REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION</u> |
| Correctional Institution; and Henry |) | |
| McMaster, Attorney General of the State of |) | |
| South Carolina, |) | |
| |) | |
| Respondents. |) | |
| _____ |) | |

Petitioner, Christopher Hudson (“Hudson”), is an inmate at the South Carolina Department of Corrections serving a sentence of ten years imprisonment for armed robbery with two years concurrent on two unrelated drug charges. He filed a pro se petition for a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254 alleging that he is in custody in violation of the Constitution of the United States. The case was automatically referred to the undersigned pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 73.02 (B)(2)(c), DSC. Respondents filed a motion for summary judgment, supported by copies of portions of the state court record, on October 16, 2006. Because petitioner is proceeding pro se, an order pursuant to Roseboro v. Garrison, 528 F.2d 309 (4th Cir. 1975), was issued on October 17, 2006, advising petitioner of his responsibility to properly respond to the motion for summary judgment. Petitioner filed his response on November 3, 2006.

Procedural History

Hudson pled guilty to the charges pursuant to a negotiated plea on June 6, 2002. He was sentenced by the Honorable L. Henry McKellar. Hudson was represented by Hugh Roberts. No direct appeal was filed.

On September 16, 2002, Hudson filed an application for post-conviction relief in the Court of Common Pleas for Richland County. He alleged that Roberts was ineffective for inadequately explaining the armed robbery charge to him¹ (App. 22) and that the trial court failed to inform him “of effect of supervised release on completion of his 85% [of] his sentence.”² (App. 23). An evidentiary hearing was held before the Honorable L. Casey Manning on April 23, 2004 (App. 29). Hudson was represented by Tara Dawn Shurling. He testified on his own behalf. Mr. Roberts was called as a witness by the State. Judge Manning issued an order of dismissal filed December 8, 2004. (App. 64).

A Johnson³ petition for writ of certiorari was filed on Hudson’s behalf by the South Carolina Office of Appellate Defense raising the following issue:

Petitioner’s guilty plea failed to comply with the mandates set forth in Boykin v. Alabama.

Hudson also filed a pro se petition in the Supreme Court pursuant to state procedure. He asserted:

Whether the plea record fully demonstrates petitioner’s guilty plea was valid under Boykin v. Alabama, 395 U.S. 238, 89 S.Ct. 1709, 23 L.Ed.2d (1969), and under McCarthy, 394 U.S. 89, S.Ct. 22 L.Ed. 2d (1969)?

¹Hudson asserts that he thought he was pleading guilty to “strong armed robbery” instead of armed robbery.

²The trial court specifically told Hudson he would have to serve 8 ½ years of his 10 year sentence for armed robbery. (App. 9).

³Johnson v. State, 294 S.C. 310, 364 S.E.2d 2001 (1988).

Hudson presented numerous arguments in connection with the stated issue.

Grounds for Relief

Hudson asserts that he is entitled to a writ of habeas corpus on the following grounds:

Guilty plea was unknowingly, as well as, without a full understanding due to judges failure to comply with the mandated requirements of the plea process.

Discussion

Respondents assert that Hudson's claims are procedurally barred because they were not properly developed and presented to the South Carolina Supreme Court for review. Alternatively, they argue that even if Hudson's claims are considered on their merits, he is not entitled to relief.

A. Involuntary Guilty Plea

Hudson asserts that his right to due process was violated because the trial court failed to advise him that at his guilty plea he was waiving his right against self incrimination, his right to confrontation, and his right to a trial by jury. He also asserts that the trial court failed to advise him of the essential elements of the offenses to which he pled guilty.

Review fo the record shows that this claim is without merit. Both counsel and the trial court advised Hudson of his right to a jury trial. (App. 5-6). Further, Boykin v. Alabama, 395 U.S. 238 (1969) does not require that a state defendant be fully advised of each constitutional right he is waiving by pleading guilty. Wade v. Coiner, 468 F.2d 1059, 1060 (4th Cir. 1972) ("If the record affirmatively shows that the plea was intelligently and voluntarily entered, that is enough."); Beck v. Angelone, 173 F.Supp.2d 461, 479 (E.D.Va. 2000); and Davis v. Ozmint, 4:05-0033-CMC-TER, 2006 WL 287638. The transcript of the plea hearing shows that the Solicitor gave a factual basis for all the charges to which Hudson agreed. The undersigned concludes that the record affirmatively

demonstrates that Hudson voluntarily and intelligently entered his guilty plea. He understood the nature of the charges and the consequences of his plea.

B. Ineffective Assistance of Trial Counsel

Hudson's grounds for relief, quoted above, do not allege ineffective assistance of counsel. However, at the PCR hearing, Hudson's attorney informed the court that Hudson's application was based on the ground that "his pleas of guilty were not voluntarily and intelligently entered in as much as they were the produce of ineffective assistance of counsel." (App. 32-33). The PCR court addressed Hudson's application only on the basis of ineffective assistance of counsel. The PCR court rejected Hudson's claim that "trial counsel negotiated a plea for strong armed robbery but that he ended up pleading guilty to armed robbery." (App. 64). On page 5 of his response to respondents' motion for summary judgment, Hudson attempts to resurrect this claim. He states, "(T)rial counsel failed to make sure that the plea deal he was promised was kept. Petitioner argues that he was told, by his trial counsel, that if he plead (sic), the prosecutor would let him plead to an (sic) lesser offense in which was 'strong armed robbery' concerning the charge of 'armed robbery' as well as all other charges to be run concurrently."

The problem with this allegation, beside the fact that Hudson failed to include it in his petition, is that it is completely unsupported in the record. In fact, Hudson testified to the contrary at his PCR hearing. Hudson denied that he and his attorney ever discussed "being allowed to plead to something other than armed robbery." (App. 39). Hudson further criticized his attorney because "he didn't put much effort in looking into my case to get me a lesser charge or get me to plead to a lesser charge like the rest of my co-defendants." (App. 45).⁴ The PCR court applied the Strickland

⁴Hudson's three co-defendants apparently were allowed to plead to something less than
(continued...)

standard to this claim and found that Hudson “had notice that he was pleading guilty to a negotiated sentence on armed robbery for ten years and the other two to run concurrently. This Court finds that the applicant has not established a different negotiated sentence.” (App. 66).

The Sixth Amendment to the United States Constitution guarantees a defendant the right to effective assistance of counsel in a criminal prosecution. McMann v. Richardson, 397 U.S. 759, 771 n.14 (1970). In the case of Strickland v. Washington, 466 U.S. 668 (1984), the United States Supreme Court set forth two factors that must be considered in evaluating claims for ineffective assistance of counsel. A petitioner must first show that his counsel committed error. If an error can be shown, the court must consider whether the commission of an error resulted in prejudice to the defendant.

To meet the first requirement, “[t]he defendant must show that counsel’s representation fell below an objective standard of reasonableness.” Strickland, at 688. “The proper measure of attorney performance remains simply reasonableness under prevailing professional norms.” Turner v. Bass, 753 F.2d 342, 348 (4th Cir. 1985) quoting Strickland, *reversed on other grounds*, 476 U.S. 28 (1986). In meeting the second prong of the inquiry, a complaining defendant must show that he was prejudiced before being entitled to reversal. Strickland requires that:

[T]he defendant must show that there is a reasonable probability that, but for counsel’s unprofessional errors, the result of the proceeding would have been different. A reasonable probability is a probability sufficient to undermine confidence in the outcome.

* * *

⁴(...continued)

armed robbery. Roberts testified at the PCR hearing that his efforts to negotiate a similar plea for Hudson ended when Hudson was later arrested on the drug charges. (App. 51).

[A] court deciding an actual ineffectiveness claim must judge the reasonableness of counsel's challenged conduct on the facts of the particular case, viewed as of the time of counsel's conduct. . . the court must then determine whether, in light of all the circumstances, the identified acts or omissions were outside the wide range of professionally competent assistance. (Emphasis added).

Strickland at 694-95.

Under the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 ("AEDPA"), a federal habeas court must determine whether the state court's decision "was contrary to, or involved an unreasonable application of clearly established Federal law, as determined by the Supreme Court of the United States." 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d)(1). The court's analysis should center on whether the state courts properly applied the Strickland test. See Williams v. Taylor, 529 U.S. 362 (2000). ("Strickland test provides sufficient guidance for resolving virtually all ineffective assistance of counsel claims.")

Ineffective assistance of counsel claims may be asserted in limited circumstances where the petitioner has entered a plea of guilty. A guilty plea generally precludes the petitioner from challenging defects in the process which occurred prior to the plea. He "may only attack the voluntary and intelligent character of the guilty plea by showing that the advice he received from counsel was not within the standards set forth in McMann." Tollett v. Henderson, 411 U.S. 258, 267 (1973). When such a claim is raised, the voluntariness issue is subsumed within the claim of effectiveness of the attorney's assistance. Hill v. Lockhart, 474 U.S. 52, 56 (1985).

In order to prevail on a claim of ineffective assistance of counsel pertaining to a guilty plea, a petitioner must show that his lawyer's performance was incompetent, i.e., the first prong of the Strickland test. Under this prong, counsel "has a duty to make reasonable investigations or to make a reasonable decision that makes particular investigations unnecessary." Strickland, 466 U.S. at 691.

The prejudice prong of the Strickland test is modified and the petitioner must show “that there is a reasonable probability that, but for counsel’s errors, he would not have pleaded guilty and would have insisted on going to trial.” Hill, 474 U.S. at 59.

The undersigned concludes that the PCR court correctly applied the Strickland standard in this case.

C. Procedural Bar

Exhaustion and procedural bypass are separate theories which operate in a similar manner to require a habeas petitioner to first submit his claims for relief to the state courts. The two theories rely on the same rationale. The general rule is that a petitioner must present his claim to the highest state court with authority to decide the issue before the federal court will consider the claim.

1. Exhaustion

The theory of exhaustion is based on the statute giving the federal court jurisdiction of habeas petitions. Applications for writs of habeas corpus are governed by 28 U.S.C. § 2254, which allows relief when a person “is in custody in violation of the Constitution or laws or treaties of the United States.” The statute states in part:

- (b)(1) An application for a writ of habeas corpus on behalf of a person in custody pursuant to the judgment of a State court, shall not be granted unless it appears that
 - (A) the applicant has exhausted the remedies available in the courts of the State; or
 - (B)(i) there is either an absence of available State corrective process; or
 - (ii) circumstances exist that render such process ineffective to protect the rights of the applicant.

- (2) An application for a writ of habeas corpus may be denied on the merits, notwithstanding the failure of the applicant to exhaust the remedies available in the courts of the State.
- (3) A State shall not be deemed to have waived the exhaustion requirement or be estopped from reliance upon the requirement unless the State, through counsel, expressly waives the requirement.
- (c) An applicant shall not be deemed to have exhausted the remedies available in the courts of the State, within the meaning of this section, if he has the right under the law of the State to raise, by any available procedure, the question presented.

This statute clearly requires that an applicant pursue any and all opportunities in the state courts before seeking relief in the federal court. When subsections (b) and (c) are read in conjunction, it is clear that § 2254 requires a petitioner to present any claim he has to the state courts before he can proceed on the claim in this court. See O’Sullivan v. Boerckel, 526 U.S. 838 (1999).

The United States Supreme Court has consistently enforced the exhaustion requirement.

The exhaustion doctrine existed long before its codification by Congress in 1948. In Ex parte Royall, 117 U.S. 241, 251 (1886), this Court wrote that as a matter of comity, federal courts should not consider a claim in a habeas corpus petition until after the state courts have had an opportunity to act....

Rose v. Lundy, 455 U.S. 509, 515 (1982).

In South Carolina, a person in custody has two primary means of attacking the validity of his conviction. The first avenue is through a direct appeal and, pursuant to state law, he is required to state all his grounds in that appeal. See SCACR 207(b)(1)(B) and Blakeley v. Rabon, 266 S.C. 68, 221 S.E.2d 767 (1976). The second avenue is by filing an application for post-conviction relief (“PCR”). See S.C. Code Ann. § 17-27-10 et seq. A PCR applicant is also required to state all of his grounds for relief in his application. See, S. C. Code Ann. § 17-27-90. Strict time deadlines govern direct appeal and the filing of a PCR in the South Carolina Courts. A PCR must be filed

within one year of judgment, or if there is an appeal, within one year of the appellate court decision. S.C. Code Ann. § 17-27-45.

When the petition for habeas relief is filed in the federal court, a petitioner may present only those issues which were presented to the South Carolina Supreme Court through direct appeal or through an appeal from the denial of the PCR application, whether or not the Supreme Court actually reached the merits of the claim.⁵ If any avenue of state relief is still available, the petitioner must proceed through the state courts before requesting a writ of habeas corpus in the federal courts, Patterson v. Leeke, 556 F.2d 1168 (4th Cir. 1977) and Richardson v. Turner, 716 F.2d 1059 (4th Cir. 1983). If petitioner has failed to raise the issue before the state courts, but still has any means to do so, he will be required to return to the state courts to exhaust the claims. See Rose v. Lundy, *supra*.

2. Procedural bypass⁶

Procedural bypass is the doctrine applied when the person seeking relief failed to raise the claim at the appropriate time in state court and has no further means of bringing that issue before the state courts. If this occurs, the person is procedurally barred from raising the issue in his federal habeas petition. The United States Supreme Court has clearly stated that the procedural bypass of a constitutional claim in earlier state proceedings forecloses consideration by the federal courts, Smith v. Murray, 477 U.S. 527, 533 (1986). Bypass can occur at any level of the state proceedings, if a state has procedural rules which bar its courts from considering claims not raised in a timely fashion. The two routes of appeal in South Carolina are described above, and the

⁵In cases where the South Carolina Supreme Court applied a procedural bar, however, this court is directed to also apply that bar, except in certain limited circumstances. See discussion below on procedural bypass.

⁶This concept is sometimes referred to as procedural bar or procedural default. If a petitioner procedurally bypasses his state remedies, he is procedurally barred from raising them in this court.

South Carolina Supreme Court will refuse to consider claims raised in a second appeal which could have been raised at an earlier time. Further, if a prisoner has failed to file a direct appeal or a PCR and the deadlines for filing have passed, he is barred from proceeding in state court.

If the state courts have applied a procedural bar to a claim because of an earlier default in the state courts, the federal court honors that bar. State procedural rules promote

not only the accuracy and efficiency of judicial decisions, but also the finality of those decisions, by forcing the defendant to litigate all of his claims together, as quickly after trial as the docket will allow, and while the attention of the appellate court is focused on his case.

Reed v. Ross, 468 U.S. 1, 10-11 (1984).

Although the federal courts have the power to consider claims despite a state procedural bar,

the exercise of that power ordinarily is inappropriate unless the defendant succeeds in showing both ‘cause’ for noncompliance with the state rule and ‘actual prejudice resulting from the alleged constitutional violation.’

Smith v. Murray, *supra*, quoting Wainwright v. Sykes, 433 U.S. at 84 (1977); *see also* Engle v. Isaac, 456 U.S. 107, 135 (1982).

Stated simply, if a federal habeas petitioner can show (1) cause for his failure to raise the claim in the state courts, and (2) actual prejudice resulting from the failure, a procedural bar can be ignored and the federal court may consider the claim. Where a petitioner has failed to comply with state procedural requirements and cannot make the required showing(s) of cause and prejudice, the federal courts generally decline to hear the claim. *See Murray v. Carrier*, 477 U.S. 478, 496 (1986).

3. Inter-relation of Exhaustion and Procedural Bypass

As a practical matter, if a petitioner in this court has failed to raise a claim in state court, and is precluded by state rules from returning to state court to raise the issue, he has procedurally bypassed his opportunity for relief in the state courts, and this court is barred from

considering the claim (absent a showing of “cause” and “actual prejudice”). In such an instance, the exhaustion requirement is “technically met” and the rules of procedural bar apply. Matthews v. Evatt, 105 F.3d 907 (4th Cir. 1997); cert. denied, 522 U.S. 833 (1997) citing Coleman v. Thompson, 501 U.S. 722, 735 n.1 (1991); Teague v. Lane, 489 U.S. 288, 297-98 (1989); and George v. Angelone, 100 F.3d 353, 363 (4th Cir. 1996).

4. Excusing Default

The requirement of exhaustion is not jurisdictional, and this court may consider claims which have not been presented to the South Carolina Supreme Court in limited circumstances. Granberry v. Greer, 481 U.S. 129, 131 (1989). First, a petitioner may obtain review of a procedurally barred claim by establishing cause for the default and actual prejudice from the failure to review the claim. Coleman v. Thompson, 501 U.S. at 750 and Gary v. Netherland, 518 U.S. 152, 162 (1996). Second, a petitioner may rely on the doctrine of actual innocence.

A petitioner must show both cause and actual prejudice to obtain relief from a defaulted claim. In this context, “cause” is defined as “some objective factor external to the defense [that] impeded counsel’s efforts to comply with the State’s procedural rule.” Strickler v. Greene, 527 U.S. 263, 283 n. 24 (1999) (quoting Murray v. Carrier, 477 U.S. 478, 488 (1986)). A petitioner may establish cause if he can demonstrate ineffective assistance of counsel relating to the default, show an external factor which hindered compliance with the state procedural rule, demonstrate the novelty of his claim, or show interference by state officials. Murray v. Carrier; Clozza v. Murray, 913 F.3d 1092 (4th Cir. 1990), cert. denied, 499 U.S. 913 (1991); and Clanton v. Muncy, 845 F.2d 1238 (4th Cir.), cert. denied, 485 U.S. 1000 (1988). A petitioner must show reasonable diligence in pursuing his claim to establish cause. Hoke v. Netherland, 92 F.3d 1350, 1354 n. 1 (4th Cir. 1996). Further, the claim of cause must itself be exhausted. Edwards v. Carpenter, 529 U.S. 446 (2000) (failure of

counsel to present issue on direct appeal must be exhausted in collateral proceeding as ineffective assistance to establish cause for default).

Generally, a petitioner must show some error to establish prejudice. Tucker v. Catoe, 221 F.3d 600, 615 (4th Cir.), cert. denied, 531 U.S. 1054 (2000). Additionally, a petitioner must show an actual and substantial disadvantage as a result of the error, not merely a possibility of harm to show prejudice. Satcher v. Pruett, 126 F.3d 561, 572 (4th Cir. 1997).

“Actual innocence” is not an independent claim, but only a method of excusing default. O’Dell v. Netherland, 95 F.3d 1214, 1246 (4th Cir. 1996), *aff’d*, 521 U.S. 151 (1997). To prevail under this theory, a petitioner must produce new evidence not available at trial to establish his factual innocence. Royal v. Taylor, 188 F.3d 239 (4th Cir. 1999). A petitioner may establish actual innocence as to his guilt, Id., or his sentence. Matthews v. Evatt, 105 F.3d 907, 916 (4th Cir. 1997).

5. Procedure

Procedural default is an affirmative defense which is waived if not raised by respondents. Gray v. Netherland, 518 U.S. at 165-66. It is petitioner’s burden to raise cause and prejudice or actual innocence. If not raised by petitioner, the court need not consider the defaulted claim. Kornahrens v. Evatt, 66 F.3d 1350 (4th Cir. 1995), cert. denied, 517 U.S. 1171 (1996).

After denial of the PCR, appellate counsel filed a Johnson petition for writ of certiorari⁷ with the South Carolina Supreme Court. In Johnson v. State, 294 S.C. 310, 364 S.E.2d 201 (1988), the South Carolina Supreme Court adopted a procedure for appeal where appellate counsel concludes that the PCR applicant has no meritorious grounds to present. Counsel is required to file the Johnson petition raising any issue which is arguably appealable and requesting leave to withdraw

⁷All appeals from the denial of a PCR application are made by seeking a writ of certiorari from the South Carolina Supreme Court. See SCACR 227.

as attorney for the petitioner on appeal. A copy of the brief is furnished to the applicant and he is notified that he has a specific period of time to furnish further information to the Supreme Court for consideration in making a determination as to the Johnson petition. The applicant may file a pro se brief raising additional issues. Foster v. State, 298 S.C. 306, 379 S.E.2d 907 (1989). In ruling on a Johnson petition for writ of certiorari, the South Carolina Supreme Court necessarily considers the issue or issues raised in the Johnson petition and any issues raised by the applicant in his pro se brief. Further, the South Carolina Supreme Court conducts a review of the record when a Johnson petition is filed. King v. State, 308 S.C. 348, 417 S.E.2d 868 (1992). In so doing, the South Carolina Supreme Court will only consider those issues raised by the PCR application upon which evidence was presented **and** were ruled on by the PCR court. The South Carolina Supreme Court applies a procedural bar to issues which do not meet this criteria. Under South Carolina law, the PCR court is required to make specific findings of fact and conclusions of law as to each issue raised in the PCR. See S.C. Code Ann. § 17-27-80 and Rule 52(a) SCRCP. Bryson v. State, 328 S.C. 236, 493 S.E.2d 500 (1997). Counsel is required to object to any deficiencies in the order of the PCR court. McCullough v. State, 320 S.C. 270, 464 S.E.2d 340 (1995). This duty falls on the PCR applicant if not raised by counsel in the Johnson petition. See Pruitt v. State, 310 S.C. 254, 423 S.E.2d 127, 128 n.2 (1992) ("the general rule [is] that issues must be raised to, and ruled on by, the post-conviction judge to be preserved for appellate review."). See also, Padgett v. State, 324 S.C. 22, 484 S.E.2d 101 (1997) (issues not ruled on by PCR court are not preserved for appeal). Thus, when considering a Johnson petition, the South Carolina Supreme Court considers only those issues raised by the Johnson petition, raised in any pro se brief or petition filed by the applicant, and those issues specifically ruled on by the PCR court.

Although Hudson's present claim was not properly developed at the PCR hearing and was not addressed by the PCR court in its order of dismissal, it was presented for review to the South Carolina Supreme Court. Therefore, the undersigned concludes that respondents are not entitled to summary judgment on this basis.

Conclusion

Based on a review of the record, the undersigned recommends that the respondents' motion for summary judgment be granted, and the petition dismissed without an evidentiary hearing.

Respectfully submitted,

s/Joseph R. McCrorey
United States Magistrate Judge

April 20, 2007
Columbia, South Carolina

The parties' attention is directed to the important information on the attached notice.

Notice of Right to File Objections to Report and Recommendation

The parties are advised that they may file specific written objections to this Report and Recommendation with the District Court Judge. Objections must specifically identify the portions of the Report and Recommendation to which objections are made and the basis for such objections. In the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must “only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310 (4th Cir. 2005).

Specific written objections must be filed within ten (10) days of the date of service of this Report and Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). The time calculation of this ten-day period excludes weekends and holidays and provides for an additional three (3) days for filing by mail. Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(a) & (e). Filing by mail pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 5 may be accomplished by mailing objections to:

Larry W. Propes, Clerk
United States District Court
901 Richland Street
Columbia, South Carolina 29201

Failure to timely file specific written objections to this Report and Recommendation will result in waiver of the right to appeal from a judgment of the District Court based upon such Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *United States v. Schronce*, 727 F.2d 91 (4th Cir. 1984); *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841 (4th Cir. 1985).